

and Cultural Rights and take a few other token steps, I see no evidence of real human rights improvement on the ground in China. The fact that human rights conditions in China are growing worse, not better, demands that human rights continue to be a top priority in our China policy—but it is not a priority, and the rulers in Beijing know that.

Nearly four years after the President's decision to de-link most-favored-nation status from human rights—a decision I have always said was a mistake—we cannot forget that the human rights situation in China and Tibet remains abysmal. Hundreds, if not thousands of Chinese and Tibetan citizens are detained or imprisoned for their political and religious beliefs. The press is subject to oppressive restrictions. And monks and nuns in Tibet are harassed for showing reverence to the Dalai Lama.

In a well-quoted sentence, the most recent State Department human rights report notes that "the Government of China continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, including extra-judicial killings, the use of torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, forced abortion and sterilization, the sale of organs from executed prisoners, and tight control over the exercise of the rights of freedom of speech, press and religions." If that shameful litany is not grounds for a tougher policy, please, somebody, tell me what is!

Today, on the ninth anniversary of one of the most traumatic events in the modern history of China, we remember the courageous people who stood before the tanks, who gave their lives for bravely choosing to express their notions of freedom and breathed their last on the bloody paving stones of Tiananmen, and we honor those heroes who continue to take risks to struggle for real change in China and Tibet.

It is unfortunate, then, that the President's proposed trip to Beijing, which will take place in just a few weeks, will send the wrong signal—not only to China's leaders, but also to those in China and Tibet who have worked so tirelessly to achieve the basic freedoms that we, as Americans, take for granted. In particular, in a move that almost adds insult to injury, the President has agreed to stage his arrival ceremony in Tiananmen Square itself.

If ever a moment cried out for a gesture, Mr. President, that will be the moment. That will be the chance for our President to restore some small moral weight to our China policy.

Mr. President, if the President of the United States feels he must go to Beijing, if he feels he must go there this month, a month when we remember and honor the heroes of Tiananmen, and if he feels he must visit the site of that horrible 1989 massacre, I hope he will take the time to visit with the

families of the victims—a suggestion I made to Assistant Secretary of State Stanley Roth in a recent Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing.

Finally, it is imperative that throughout his visit to China, the President send a clear unequivocal message about the importance of human rights, of the rule of law and of democracy. The students at Tiananmen erected a goddess of democracy. Our China policy worships trade and pays short shrift to the ideal of freedom. Our policy has got to change.

We owe as much to the victims, to the champions of democracy in China today, and to the American people.●

SENATOR PELL ON CUBAN POLICY

● Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to submit an editorial on U.S. policy toward Cuba written by my esteemed predecessor, the Honorable Claiborne Pell. The editorial was printed in the May 5, 1998 edition of the Providence Journal Bulletin.

Senator Pell served in the United States Senate for thirty-six years. While in the Senate, he served as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations for eight years. Senator Pell's remarkable career also included eight years of service as a State Department Official and Foreign Service Officer as well as the United States Representative to the 25th and 51st Sessions of the United Nations General Assembly. Senator Pell's positions have taken him to Cuba on three occasions, most recently in early May. Senator Pell's observations of American foreign policy toward Cuba have led him to the conclusion that continuing the 38 year embargo on Cuba will not destabilize the Castro regime and is hurting the Cuban people.

In his editorial, Senator Pell makes a number of insightful points. I hope all my colleagues will take the opportunity to read this piece by an expert in foreign relations and seriously consider his observations regarding relations with our neighbor.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial from the Providence Journal Bulletin be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Providence Journal-Bulletin, May 5, 1998]

OUR CUBA POLICY HAS NOT WORKED

One can only hope that the small but significant changes in U.S. policy toward Cuba that President Clinton announced in late March portend more sweeping changes in the months ahead toward a more rational, more self-interested and more effective U.S. policy.

Having just returned from a five-day visit to Cuba with a distinguished group of Americans, I am more convinced than ever that our existing policy, built around the 38-year-old embargo of Cuba, simply doesn't work.

The embargo upsets the Cuban government and hurts the Cuban people, but, from our discussions with an array of Cuban government officials, religious and dissident leaders and foreign diplomat observers, one thing emerged clearly: The Cuban economy is

strong enough to limp along for the foreseeable future. There is no evidence at all to suggest that U.S. economic sanctions are any more likely to destabilize the Castro regime in the near future than they have been over the past 38 years.

Cuba is now some six years into what the regime euphemistically calls the "special period," the time of economic distress that began with the collapse of the Soviet Union. Cuba lost its preferential trading arrangement with Moscow and the other former communist republics of Eastern Europe, and was left to fend for itself.

If U.S. economic pressure was ever to work, that was the time. But Cuba has muddled through. In moves that must have been bitter pills for Castro to swallow, Cuba "dollarized" its economy, allowed private farmers' markets and other small-scale private enterprises, and offered more favorable terms for foreign investment.

As a result, the Cuban economy, in free fall during 1993, has started to come around. The evidence abounds in Havana. Not only tourists, but all Cubans can purchase an array of consumer goods in "dollar stores" that are prevalent in Havana. When we asked one government official how Cubans with no access to dollars can survive, he shot back: "Who doesn't have dollars?"

One exquisite irony is that this dollar-focused Cuban economy is now in part propped up by an annual deluge of dollars, estimated at \$600 million to \$1 billion, that arrives in Cuba from the United States, primarily from Cuban-Americans anxious to make life easier for their relatives. Whatever pain the embargo causes is offset by this dollar flow, which they will likely increase with the restoration of legal remittances.

Tourism has expanded greatly since I last visited Cuba 10 years ago, and brings both much needed hard currency and less desirable consequences, including prostitution, which seems widespread in parts of Havana after dark. Our delegation visited only Havana and we were told that times are tougher in the smaller cities and the countryside. But the Cuban economy has clearly recovered and, while it could benefit from many more reforms, there is no sign it will collapse.

Cuba is still very much an authoritarian state with tight state control over all aspects of society, including public debate. One day, I visited a showplace medical campus where very interesting neurological research is being conducted. The center was equipped with what appeared to be sophisticated computers and has its own "web site."

Next, I sat with a group of dissidents and asked about their access to the Internet. "We can't use the Internet," one said. "We cannot even have computers; they just take them away."

Yet I felt a much greater openness in Havana this time than in my last visit, and certainly than in 1974, when Sen. Jacob Javits (the late U.S. Republican senator from New York) and I were among the first members of Congress to visit since the revolution. Back then, we were shadowed everywhere we went, were confident our hotel rooms were bugged, and sensed a real oppressiveness in the city. In those days, the infamous Committees for the Defense of the Revolution were an effective neighborhood spy network; today, they seem more a network of aging busybodies. Havana is certainly not a free city, but it has a liveliness and verve that startled me.

On this trip, everywhere we went people still were abuzz about the visit of the Pope. Church leaders do not know yet whether the visit, of which virtually all Cubans seemed immensely proud, will lead to much greater openness. But colleagues of mine went to Mass on Sunday at a Jesuit church in a run-down section of the city, and described a vibrant community with an abundance of

young adults worshipping with pride and intensity. The dissidents we met reported that a substantial number of political offenders have been freed and the atmosphere seems to them "more relaxed."

Cuba's repressive communist regime has survived, if not thrived, for 38 years in economic isolation from the United States. When a policy has failed that long, isn't it time to try something else? In my view, a policy of contact, trade, cultural exchanges and dialogue, just as we had with the communist states of Europe, could well lead to a more open, free-market economy and more political diversity in Cuba. Even if it doesn't, it won't be any less effective than the policy we've been following these past 38 years.●

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE OF PRO-DEMOCRACY DEMONSTRATORS ON TIANANMEN SQUARE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of a Senate resolution at the desk which would express the sense of the Senate on the ninth anniversary of the massacre of prodemocracy demonstrators on Tiananmen Square in China. I ask further consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I find myself in the awkward position of having to object to consideration of my own resolution. I want to make this clear that I am doing this solely as a courtesy to the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am really surprised and shocked that apparently there is objection on the Democratic side of the aisle to consideration of this important resolution. I had hoped that we would consider this evening a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate upon the ninth anniversary of the tragic massacre of Chinese students in Tiananmen Square on June 4, 1989.

My resolution, had I been permitted to proceed with it this evening, was co-sponsored by the distinguished majority leader, by the Senator from Arkansas, Senator HUTCHINSON, and by the Senator from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM. Regrettably, my colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle have blocked consideration of this resolution. I would, however, like to take a moment to explain why I consider it to be very important.

Mr. President, 9 years ago, thousands of students were peaceably assembled on Tiananmen Square in Beijing, peacefully protesting their government's refusal to permit them even the most basic freedoms of expression, association, and political activity.

As a symbol of their hopes and aspirations for a democratic China, these students constructed a scale model of our own Statue of Liberty. It was to

them, as it is to us and to untold millions around the world, a symbol of freedom's promise for people everywhere. Quoting Thomas Jefferson, these brave Chinese students spoke eloquently of the need for China to develop democratic institutions, and finally to allow a degree of political progress to match its dramatic economic change and development in recent years.

Nine years ago today—today—the excitement and the promise of this Chinese democracy movement were extinguished as troops and armored vehicles were ordered into action against the peaceful students. Mr. President, it may never be known exactly how many died in the resulting bloodbath, but hundreds of Chinese demonstrators were certainly killed and many thousands more were arrested for so-called counterrevolutionary offenses that consisted only of attempting to assert rights that it is the duty of civilized governments everywhere to observe, protect and promote.

I am wearing, Mr. President, a ribbon to commemorate just one of those political prisoners from that very sad period.

I had hoped to introduce and have the Senate pass this resolution to make very clear to everyone in this country and, indeed, around the globe that the U.S. Senate has not forgotten what occurred in Tiananmen Square 9 years ago today.

Mr. President, my resolution sought to do no more than to make clear that what occurred on June 4, 1989, was profoundly wrong and that we should not permit ourselves or our Government ever to forget this. This resolution would have merely expressed the sense of the Senate that our Government should remain committed to honoring the memory and the spirit of the Chinese citizens who died on Tiananmen Square and that assisting China's peaceful transition to democracy should be a principal goal of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, it is important that we remember Tiananmen Square today precisely because we do enjoy increasingly close ties with the regime in Beijing. Relations with the People's Republic of China are—and must—be a continual balancing act. The memory of Tiananmen Square should help us find the appropriate bounds, preventing us from giving way to a wholly unchecked enthusiasm in U.S.-Chinese relations by disregarding the fundamental nature of the regime with which we are dealing. China is not a democracy, after all, and its government still has few qualms about using armed force to suppress the legitimate aspirations of its people for basic liberties.

I do not expect democracy to flower overnight in China. But it is today quite clear that China is capable of democracy. The very strength of the student movement that Communist authorities tried to crush on Tiananmen Square nine years ago attests to the

powerful appeal that democracy and human rights have in China. The successes of pro-democracy candidates in Hong Kong's recent elections also attest to how strong democratic ideals can be in China when not suppressed by autocrats intent upon preserving their own power and privileges. Most of all, the new and thriving democracy on Taiwan stands as the clearest indication that the phrase "Chinese democracy" is not an oxymoron. In fact, the phrase "Chinese democracy is a ray of hope for a quarter of our planet's population."

This is why it is important always to keep Tiananmen Square in our minds as we pursue our "engagement" with China. While we cannot ignore China and its huge population, neither can we ignore the human rights abuses committed by its government. Sound public policymaking is about pragmatism, but it is about the pragmatic pursuit of principles. Without principle, pragmatism is no more than a fraud, a process that lacks a purpose; there is no substitute for an underlying moral compass. This is why I very much wanted to introduce my resolution today: in U.S.-China relations, the memory of Tiananmen Square is one of the cardinal points on our moral compass, without which we cannot navigate.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution I would have introduced be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES.—

Whereas in the spring of 1989, thousands of students demonstrated in Tiananmen Square in Beijing in favor of greater democracy, civil liberties, and freedom of expression in the People's Republic of China (PRC);

Whereas these students' protests against political repression in their homeland were conducted peacefully and posed no threat to their fellow Chinese citizens;

Whereas on the evening of June 4, 1989, these students were brutally attacked by infantry and armored vehicles of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) acting under orders from the highest political and military leadership of the PRC;

Whereas hundreds of these students were killed by the PLA in Tiananmen Square on June 4, 1989 for offenses no more serious than that of seeking peacefully to assert their most basic human, civil, and political rights;

Whereas many of the leaders of the student demonstrations thus attacked were subsequently imprisoned, sought out for arrest, or otherwise persecuted by the Government of the PRC;

Whereas during or shortly after the brutal assault of June 4, 1989, at least 2,500 persons were arrested for so-called "counter-revolutionary offenses" across China and dozens of persons were executed;

Whereas the Chinese government has never expressed regret for its actions on June 4, 1989, still imprisons at least 150 persons in connection with the Tiananmen Square demonstrations, and has continued to deny its citizens basic internationally-recognized human, civil, and political rights;

Whereas the Government of the PRC, as detailed in successive annual reports on